

Delaware Homeland Security Terrorism Preparedness Working Group
Delaware Emergency Management Agency
Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2009

1. Director James Turner convened the Delaware Homeland Security Terrorism Preparedness Working Group (DHSTPWG) meeting at 1:30 p.m. in the Delaware Emergency Management Agency (DEMA) Training Room. The following documents were provided to meeting participants:
 - a. Meeting Notice & Agenda
 - b. Equipment/Planning Progress Report
 - c. Working Group Meeting Minutes from July 13, 2009
 - d. Training and Exercise Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from July 22, 2009
 - e. Training and Exercise Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from September 2, 2009
 - f. Gain and Sustain Percentages by Target Capability Sheet
 - g. FY2006 and FY2007 Homeland Security Grant Program Delaware Allocation Summary
 - h. Information Bulletin # 325: FEMA GPD Grant Program Accomplishments Report Summary of Initial Findings: FY 2003-2007
 - i. Information Bulletin # 326: Amended FY 2009 SHSP, SHSP Tribal and UASI Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities Minimums
 - j. Information Bulletin # 329: Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation Requirements for Grants
 - k. FEMA State Risk Formula Letter
2. July 14, 2009 minutes were reviewed and approved. (**Motion: Mayor Bob Mooney; Second: Dave Roberts – Passed Unanimously**)
3. **Old Business:**
 - a. **Communication Interoperability**
 - 1) Next Generation 800 MHz Enhancement (Dave Roberts) – 800 MHz Enhancements are on schedule. A meeting to integrate the program within the Training and Exercise Program will take place in September 2009. (**OPEN**)
 - 2) Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Update (Tony Lee) – The FY 2009 Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant has been released. The application process is underway. A meeting is scheduled for September 23, 2009 to discuss collaborating with the Training and Exercise Program. (**OPEN**)
 - b. **Subcommittee Reports**
 - 1) Equipment Subcommittee (Joe Thomas, Chairman) – No Report
 - 2) Vehicle Subcommittee (Dave Roberts, Chairman) – No Report
 - 3) Funding Subcommittee (Allen Metheny, Chairman) – No Report

- 4) Training and Exercise Subcommittee (Robert Newnam, Chairman) – The July 22, 2009 and September 2, 2009 meeting minutes were provided. The following training requests were approved by the Subcommittee: The State of Delaware Law Enforcement request for \$17,050.00 for Explosive Ordinance Disposal Team & Special Operations Team training and the request for \$1,131.00 to attend a PPE Conference was approved. NCC Emergency Medical Services request for \$3,697.00 to train paramedics, DEMA request for \$38,740.00 for Standing Funds and \$9,785.00 for Incident Management Team training, DTI's request for \$4,000.00 for Online Training for the State's educators, and Delaware Vol. Fireman's Association request for \$34,000.00 for Building Collapse Training was approved. In addition, Robert Newnam briefed that the DECON Committee has been reorganized. **(OPEN)**
 - 5) NIMS Subcommittee (Jim Cabbage, Chairman) – No report **(OPEN)**
 - 6) Personnel Identification and Accountability Subcommittee – (Dave Carpenter, Chairman). Will Hayes briefed the Subcommittee met on July 16, 2006 and reviewed FIPS 201 Guidance, developed a Card Layout and discussed personnel credentialing guidelines. DEMA Director, Jamie Turner, received an email from Dave Carpenter during the meeting. He informed the Working Group that Dave Carpenter will provide a full report to the Working Group at October's meeting. **(OPEN)**
 - 7) Resource Management and Asset Tracking Subcommittee – (Mayor Mooney, Chairman) – Mayor Mooney cautioned it is prudent that the Statewide Responder Identification and RMAT systems remain separate operating systems. Courtney Emerson noted that the vendors are collaborating on a technical solution focused on developing an interface between the ID and RMAT Systems. Concern was voiced regarding the length of time it is taking for the ID and RMAT projects to reach the operational stage. Delays have occurred as subcommittees sought and waited on DHS guidance, as project analysis was performed and as the ID and RMAT subcommittees jointly explored integration of systems. At the July 13, 2009 meeting, Tom Steele submitted a letter with issues of concern. A response to the memorandum was attached to the July minutes and will be attached to the current minutes also. **(OPEN)**
- c. **Equipment Procurement Process** – Tony Lee reported the FY05 grant is in its final extension and will close on September 30, 2009. DEMA planners are working with Discipline representatives to close as many projects as possible. The FY06 grant is set to close on December 31, 2009.

- d. **Cost to Capability (C2C) Update** – Jennifer Dittman provided an update on the C2C pilot program. Delaware was one of 18 states/UASIs chosen to participate in the beta State Preparedness Report (SPR) and Pilot Cost to Capabilities (C2C) assessment. The C2C system is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) funding towards achieving capabilities addressing the state's effectiveness. The goal of C2C is to provide entities a management tool to evaluate the effectiveness of past projects and help steer future grant spending. The goal of the SPR was to obtain a holistic view of Delaware's preparedness through an assessment of statewide capabilities using the 37 Target Capabilities Listing (TCL) performance measurements.

An online survey process was utilized to ask the SPR questions and analyze the responses towards developing an aggregate SPR response. The response was submitted to and analysis was provided by FEMA for use in the pilot C2C. DEMA and the participants provided input to FEMA on the Pilot C2C and beta SPR processes. The C2C Pilot, Part II is underway with a new set of participants whose input will be used to make further improvements to the C2C process. The final product is anticipated to roll out in 2011. The State Preparedness Report guidance has been rolled out and DEMA is in the process of reviewing it for implementation. DEMA is considering holding a workshop to discuss the implementation process with the Disciplines.

4. New Business

- a. **Funding Reallocation** – Two Law Enforcement and one EMS reallocations were reviewed by the Working Group. A motion was presented to approve the following reallocations as presented to the Working Group:

- 1) FY06, LETPP, Investment 3: Reallocate \$199,425.14 for LE Discipline PPE Replenishment and \$27,694.22 for the Mobile Tactical Training System project.
- 2) FY07, LETPP, Investment 1 and 3: Reallocate \$1,179.64 from closed projects to support the following project cost overruns: Newark Mobile Command Vehicle contract advertising cost overrun, Wilmington PD Hostage Negotiation Vehicle and Delaware State University Radios cost overruns.
- 3) FY2007, SHSP, Investment 3: Reallocate \$6,000.00 from EMS Medication project to establish a new project to install lettering and lighting on the EMS Vehicle purchased with FY 2006 funding.

(Motion: Tim Cooper; Second: Allen Metheny – Passed Unanimously)

- b. **Fiscal Year 2009 Homeland Security Grant Program** – Tony Lee briefed on FEMA Information Bulletin 326 — Amended FY2009 SHSP, SHSP Tribal and UASI Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities Minimums. The information bulletin advised that the appropriations bill language required LETPP to be funded with the total Homeland Security Grant Program (SHGP) package funding and there are several satellite programs that did not have the 25% LE requirement. As a result, it identified Delaware's law enforcement activities minimum as \$1,796,058.00, which accounts for 28% of Delaware's total allocation. This represents a \$164,000.00 increase to the LE allocation finalized in July.

DEMA reviewed non-LEA projects for re-designation as LEA projects. The following projects were selected due to their universal content for all emergency response disciplines including law enforcement which meet the intent of the LEA:

- 1) Resource Management Asset Tracking (RMAT) \$442,080 – LEA Justification: Provides resource management and information sharing capabilities to incident commander and DIAC (fusion center) statewide.
- 2) Emergency Responder Identification \$170,000 – LEA Justification: Provides statewide identification for scene access and control by and for LE.
- 3) Sustain the multi-disciplinary warehouse utilized by PH, LE, AG, EMA, EMS, HC - \$250,000 – Provides secure storage facility for specialized law enforcement equipment and vehicles for emergency response.

A motion was made to accept the revised LEA funding solution. (**Motion: Chief William Topping; Second: Mayor Robert Mooney – Passed Unanimously**)

- c. **Fiscal Year 2005 Homeland Security Grant Funding Adjustment** – Tony Lee reported that during DEMA's initial review to close out FY05 HSGP, an administrative error was discovered. The error funded approximately \$100,000.00 of Training & Exercise projects to FY05 HSGP instead of FY06 HSGP. The error was attributed to FY05 HSGP being the first grant year of the centralized training and exercise program funding. This error should not impact disciplines' funding for FY05 and measures have been established to ensure this type of error will not happen in the future. (**CLOSED**)
- d. **Information Bulletins and FEMA State Risk Formula Letter** – Information Bulletin # 325: FEMA GDP Grant Program Accomplishments Report Summary of Initial Finding: FY 2003-2007, Information Bulletin # 326: Amended FY2009 SHSP, SHSP Tribal and UASI Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities Minimums and Information Bulletin # 329: Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation Requirements for Grant were provided to the Working Group for the Working Group's review.

In addition, a letter from FEMA on the States' Risk Formula was provided to the Working Group for review and comment. The risk formula is used by GPD to determine targeted grant allocations for each state and territory. This opportunity allows for Delaware's review of the information GPD has relative to our state and to provide any additions or corrections we identify. Comments should be provided to DEMA by September 23, 2009.

5. The meeting adjourned at 2:13 p.m.

6. **Next Meeting –October 19, 2009, 1:30 p.m. – DEMA Training Room.**



JAMES E. TURNER, III

Chairman, Delaware Homeland Security Terrorism Preparedness Working Group

1 Attachment: Attendance Roster

Note: All Meeting Handouts are available upon request.

Delaware Homeland Security Terrorism Preparedness Working Group

Meeting Attendance Roster September 14, 2009

NAME	AGENCY
Voting Members	
James Turner	Chairman
Absent	DE National Guard
Mayor Robert Mooney	Delaware League of Local Governments
Allen Metheny	DE Volunteer Firemen's Association
Joe Papili	Delaware State Police
William Topping	Police Chiefs Council Representative
Absent	Council on Police Training
Robert Newnam	DE Fire School
Absent	NCC Emergency Management
Colin Faulkner	KC Emergency Management
George Giles	Wilmington Emergency Management
Absent	SC Emergency Management
Dwayne Day	Public Works
Suzanne Raab-Long	DE Healthcare Association
Joe Hughes	DHSS, Division of Public Health
Ellen Mallenfant	DNREC
Dave Roberts	Public Safety Communications
Tim Cooper	Emergency Medical Services
Sandra Alexander	Cyber Security/Information Technology
Heather Hirst	Department of Agriculture
Robert George	Citizens Corps
Working Group Members & Guests	
Bob Briggs	Department of Safety and Homeland Security
Tom Ellis	Department of Justice
James Wright	Delaware Courts
Jim Weldin	Delaware League of Local Governments
Bob Bracco	Civil Air Patrol
Mike Chionchio	Office of the State Fire Marshal
Dave Mick	Kent County Department of Public Safety
Kurt Reuther	Delaware State Police
Carleton Carey	City of Dover
Jason Clarke	DTI, CRS
William McDaniel	DNREC
Robert Prettyman	US Attorney's Office
Grayson Clark	US Attorney's Office
Delaware Emergency Management Agency Staff	
Glenn Gillespie	Deputy Director
Tony Lee	Planning Supervisor
Courtney Emerson	Planner
Jennifer Dittman	Planner
Will Hayes	Planner
Tom Yeasted	Technical Assistance Coordinator
Tom Nesbella	Technical Assistance Coordinator

Letter from Tom Steele to Members of the Working Group

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The proposal before you is one of the most critical information technology and communications decisions you have been faced with over many years. Unfortunately I was unable to attend the committee meeting in which this subject came up for discussion or the following questions would have been asked. I apologize for taking your time this afternoon but I encourage you to consider the following prior to voting. Intrinsic in the decision you are being asked to make is to consolidate your homeland security information into one location without a backup facility connected in real-time for immediate access to you and others in an emergency. (The reason these systems were included in the original planning document approved through all state channels.)

Does what we are discussing today have the ability to have immediate access to information without delay. In other words has it yet been proven the changes currently under discussion have the ability to come immediately online to present you with the information you need in a timely fashion?

Several highly important questions needing to be answered prior to your making a decision are;

Will our homeland security information data be available immediately without the need to move personnel to a foreign site to provide operational capability? If they need to be moved to a foreign site how will the operators be transported there during an emergency that may congest roads and prevent rapid access to data at the very time it is needed?

If our backup data for this project (and other critical homeland systems) is located in a distant location, (Wilmington, Philadelphia) is the data being kept updated in real-time or is backup maintained via magnetic tape which is 24 hours or more day(s) behind in being current?

What priority (will or has been) assigned to our homeland security data; most critical, critical, high priority, etc.? Furthermore what is the definition of each of these classifications as they are compared to other state systems in time of a critical emergency?

Is the selection of a project manager for homeland security information one of being technical or one of ensuring the flow of information is coordinated not only within the state but also with our surrounding homeland security partners. In addition is it wise to trust the project management to someone without a background, training and time to stay abreast of changes to policy and procedures which affect our homeland security systems? Perhaps the solution would be a technical manager and a supervising applications project executive.

Respectfully, I would appreciate these questions being included in the minutes of the meeting.

To: Delaware Homeland Security Terrorism Preparedness Working Group (DHSTPWG)

From: Jamie Turner, Chair

Through: Tony Lee & Scott O'Connor

Date: August 17, 2009

Subject: Resource Management Asset Tracking (RMAT) System

I have had the opportunity to review the RMAT paper Mr. Steele presented to the working group on July 13, 2009. Mr. Steele's concerns regarding immediate access to RMAT information and backup - should the system fail - are legitimate and well founded. However, these concerns have been addressed since the conception of the RMAT project. The RMAT project has been classified as a State of Delaware "Top Secret" and "Disaster Recovery Criticality Level 1" initiative which must meet certain requirements pertaining to data storage, data availability, as well as physically housing data. The RMAT system will be constructed to meet all requirements.

Responses to Mr. Steele's specific questions are as follows:

Question 1:

Will our homeland security information data be available immediately without the need to move personnel to a foreign site to provide operational capability? If they need to be moved to a foreign site how will the operators be transported there during an emergency that may congest roads and prevent rapid access to data at the very time it is needed?

The RMAT system data will be stored in a primary and secondary database structure. The primary database will be housed in Dover at the Department of Technology and Information (DTI) and the secondary database housed at the Delaware Emergency Operations Center in Smyrna. The intent to house the secondary database server at DEMA is to ensure minimal disruption during a disaster. DEMA has received a waiver so this can be accomplished.

The primary and secondary databases would be synchronized real-time. Should the primary database fail, the secondary database will be activated to access system data. In speaking with an Oracle database administrator, activating the secondary database would not be immediate. An Oracle database administrator would have to remotely configure the system to access data from the secondary database, which could take ten to fifteen minutes. Remote access for system administrators would alleviate physically moving people to a foreign site to administer the system.

Question 2:

If our backup data for this project (and other critical homeland systems) is located in a distant location, (Wilmington, Philadelphia) is the data being kept updated in real-time or is backup maintained via magnetic tape which is 24 hours or more day(s) behind in being current?

As stated above, the system will be backed up "real time" between the primary and secondary databases to ensure data is accurate and up to date. Given that the RMAT Disaster Recovery Criticality Level is rated at the highest level (Level 1) for the state, not only is replication between primary and secondary system required, the system data will also be stored at an approved DTI disaster recovery site. Should both primary and secondary sites fail, a disaster recovery site outside of the state of Delaware will be utilized. The system will also implement a magnetic tape backup to be stored at a DTI approved data tape storage site.

Question 3:

What priority (will or has been) assigned to our homeland security data; most critical, critical, high priority, etc.? Furthermore what is the definition of each of these classifications as they are compared to other state systems in time of a critical emergency?

As stated above, the RMAT system has been designated as State of Delaware "Top Secret" with a Disaster Recovery Criticality Level 1. Furthermore, assigning data classification and disaster recovery criticality levels to any system is the responsibility of the agency implementing the system. In our case, the RMAT sub-committee assigned the classification of "Top Secret" and "Disaster Recovery Level 1" to the RMAT system." Both classifications are the highest rated in the state and ensures that the data is not only protected at the appropriate security levels but will be in the State's top tier for system recovery.

Finally, in June it was brought to my attention that the system would be utilizing an Oracle database. The use of this database requires a certified database administrator. To receive the certification, it would require the detailing of an employee to travel to the west coast for a four week certification program. In asking if any other state entity had certified database administrators, it was determined that Department of Technology & Information had staff with these certifications.

With the travel restrictions in place, the proposed transitional government reform to be initiated in the future, and the cost of travel & certification for additional employees utilizing Homeland Security Grant funds appeared to me to be duplicative and not in the best interests of all involved.

If you have any questions, please contact me.